



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,467	09/25/2003	Gee-Sung Chae	041933-5234	4568
9629	7590	07/03/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			VINH, LAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/669,467	CHAE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lan Vinh	1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8,10-12,25-27,37 and 39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 18-24,28-32,40-55 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,9,13-17,33-36 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments/Amendment

1. Applicant's argument, see page 17 of the response, filed 4/19/2006, that it does not appear that the office action addresses a step "etching the Ti layer to form a TiO_x", is persuasive. A new ground(s) of rejection is discussed below to properly address the claimed step as recited in claim 1.

Applicant's arguments, see page 18 with respect to the rejection of claim 51 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over Yamazaki (US 6,004,8310 and Umezaki et al (US 4,288,283) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection has been withdrawn.

The applicants also argue that the non-oxide metal portions of Yamazaki et al. remain and are not etched as recited by independent claim 1. This argument is unpersuasive because it does not commensurate with the scope of claim 1 because claim 1 does not require that "the non-oxide metal portions are etched". Since Yamazaki discloses a step of exposing the remaining Ti portions (106) of the Ti to an acidic electrolytic solution to recede/remove the electrode/Ti portion during an anodic oxidation step to form TiO_x pattern (col 4, lines 12-40; fig. 1(B), 1(C)), the step reads on the claimed step of "etching the Ti layer to remove remaining Ti metal portions of the Ti layer " as recited in claim 1

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al (US 6,004,831)

Yamazaki discloses a method for fabricating a thin film semiconductor device.

The method comprises the steps of:

forming an etching-subject layer 104 on a substrate (col 3, lines 15-17; fig. 1A)

forming a Ti layer 106 on the etching-subject layer (col 3, lines 30-37)

oxidizing a portion of the Ti layer to form an Ti_xO_y portion (col 4, lines 15-20)

exposing the remaining Ti portions (106) of the Ti to an acidic electrolytic solution to recede/remove the electrode/Ti portion during an anodic oxidation step to form Ti_xO_y pattern (col 4, lines 12-40; fig. 1(B), 1(C)) , which reads on removing remaining Ti metal portions of the Ti layer to form a Ti_xO_y pattern

etching the etching-subject layer using the Ti_xO_y pattern as a mask (col 7, lines 55-60)

removing the Ti_xO_y pattern (fig. 2 shows that Ti_xO_y pattern 109 is removed)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5, 13-14, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (US 6,004,831) in view of Umezaki et al (US 4,288,283)

Yamazaki discloses a method for fabricating a thin film semiconductor device. The method comprises the steps of:

forming an etching-subject layer 104 on a substrate (col 3, lines 15-17; fig. 1A)
forming a Ti layer 106 on the etching-subject layer (col 3, lines 30-37)
oxidizing a portion of the Ti layer to form an Ti_x pattern (col 4, lines 15-20)
exposing the remaining Ti portions (106) of the Ti to an acidic electrolytic solution to recede/remove the electrode/Ti portion during an anodic oxidation step to form Ti_x pattern (col 4, lines 12-40; fig. 1(B), 1(C)) , which reads on etching the Ti layer to remove remaining Ti metal portions of the Ti layer to form a Ti_x pattern
etching the etching-subject layer using the Ti_x pattern as a mask (col 7, lines 55-60)

removing the TiO_x pattern (fig. 2 shows that TiO_x pattern 109 is removed)

Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claims 1-3, 16, 17, Yamazaki fails to specifically disclose irradiating light on a portion of the Ti layer using a mask to form a TiO_x pattern

Umezaki discloses a method for forming a microscopic pattern comprises the step of irradiating UV light on a portion of the Ti layer using a mask to form a TiO_x pattern (col 3, lines 20-30)

One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Yamazaki method by irradiating UV light on a portion of the Ti layer using a mask to form a TiO_x pattern as per Umezaki because Umezaki discloses that thick TiO_x is obtained in executing the oxidation with UV light, it acts very effectively as a reflection reducing film (col 3, lines 29-32)

Regarding claims 4-5, Yamazaki discloses applying a HF solution to the metal electrode (col 7, lines 57-60)

Regarding claims 13-14, Yamazaki discloses forming the layer 104 of insulating film (col 3, lines 15-17)

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (US 6,004,831) in view of Umezaki et al (US 4,288,283) and further in view of Suguro (US 2001/0033023)

Yamazaki as modified by Umezki has been described above. Unlike the instant claimed invention as per claim 9, Yamazaki and Umezaki fail to disclose removing the TiOx pattern by using an etching solution having sulfuric acid

Suguro discloses a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device comprises the step of removing a TiOx layer/pattern by using an etching solution having sulfuric acid (col 4, paragraph 00520

One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Yamazaki and Umezaki method by removing the TiOx layer pattern using an etching solution having sulfuric acid as per Suguro because Suguro discloses that hot sulfuric acid should better be used as an etching solution to remove TiOX film (col 4, paragraph 0052)

5. Claims 33-36, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (US 6,004,831) in view of Umezaki et al (US 4,288,283)

Yamazaki discloses a method for fabricating a thin film semiconductor device. The method comprises the steps of:

forming an etching-subject layer 104 on a substrate (col 3, lines 15-17; fig. 1A)
forming a Ti/metal layer 106 on the etching-subject layer (col 3, lines 30-37)
oxidizing a portion of the Ti layer to form a Tiox pattern/metallic oxide layer and non-oxidized metal layer portion (col 4, lines 15-20, fig. 1C)

removing the non-oxidizing metal layer by immersing the semiconductor structure in an etching solution/first etching means (col 4, lines 12-17; fig. 1C)

etching the etching-subject layer using the TiOx pattern as a mask (col 7, lines 55-60)

removing/etching the TiOx/metallic oxide pattern (fig. 2 shows that TiOx pattern 109 is removed)

Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claim 33, Yamazaki fails to specifically disclose the step of etching the metallic oxide layer using a second etching means

Umezaki discloses a method for forming a microscopic pattern comprises the step of etching the metallic oxide using plasma etching/second etching means (col 3, lines 55-60)

Hence, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Yamazaki method by adding the step of etching the metallic oxide using plasma etching/second etching means as per Umezaki because Umezaki discloses that only the exposed part of the TiOx film can be selectively etched and removed using a chemical dry etching (col 3, lines 43-51)

The limitations of claims 34-36 have been discussed above

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 18-24, 28-32, 40-55 allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claim 18, the cited prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a pattern forming method comprises the step of etching the etching-subject layer using

the first region of the TiO₂ layer as a mask, in combination with the rest of the limitations of claim 18

Regarding claims 30, 55, the cited prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a pattern forming method comprises the step of etching a portion of TiO_x layer having a hydrophobic surface to form a hydrophilic TiO_x pattern, in combination with the rest of the limitations of claims 30, 55

Regarding claim 40, the cited prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a pattern forming method comprises the step of forming source/drain electrode on the semiconductor layer using a third metal masking layer, in combination with the rest of the limitations of claim 40

Regarding claim 51, the cited prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a method for fabricating a semiconductor device comprises the step of etching the Ti layer to remove the Ti making layer portion to form a TiO_x pattern as a mask, in combination with the rest of the limitation of claim 51

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lan Vinh whose telephone number is 571 272 1471. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571 272 1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LV
June 30, 2006